UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,809	07/10/2001	Adam W. Smith	MS1-863US	6339

22801　　7590　　07/27/2005

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/902,809	SMITH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 May 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is

closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/13/2004</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-33 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 5/9/05 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-33 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), Deitel et al. "Java How to Program Book", Third Edition, 1999,

Pages 7-29, 698-699, 714-717, 876-878, 936-977, 980-998 and 1002-1046 (Hereinafter Deitel)

does not disclose limitations, "the second class is further to obtain information regarding

capabilities of the client", "the second group of services is further related to obtaining

information regarding capabilities of a browser application running on the client", "the HTTP

response class is further to manage information regarding capabilities of the client", "the one or

more second functions are further to manage a plurality of cookies associated with a particular

web application". The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations,

"the second class is further to obtain information regarding capabilities of the client", "the

second group of services is further related to obtaining information regarding capabilities of a

browser application running on the client", "the HTTP response class is further to manage

information regarding capabilities of the client", "the one or more second functions are further to

manage a plurality of cookies associated with a particular web application", has been newly

added, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections

of this office action). Therefore, the rejection is maintained

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-6, 8-33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitel et

al. Java How to Program book, Third edition, 1999, Pages 7-29, 698-699, 714-717, 876-878,

936-977, 980-998, 1002-1046 (Hereinafter Deitel) in view of Guheen et al., 6,721,713, Andersen

Consulting LLP, (Hereinafter Guheen-Andersen).

5.   As per claims 1, 14, Deitel teaches an application program interface embodied on one or

more computer readable media (e.g., page 17), a network software architecture (e.g., chapter 21,

page 1002), a method (e.g., chapter 21, page 1002) comprising:

        a first class to provide information regarding a current HTTP request (e.g., subclasses of

HTTPServlet class, chapter 19, page 936),

        a second class to manage HTTP output to a client (e.g., subclasses of HTTPServlet class,

chapter 19, page 936),

        an object to provide access to server-side utilities and processes (e.g., Servlets, chapter

19, page 936),

a set of classes that enable building and using web services (e.g., classes and subclasses

of java.io.*, java.net.*, java.awt.*, java.awt.event.*, javax.swing.*, java.util.*, java.swing.*,

java.swing.event.*, java.applet.AppletContext, etc., page 1005).

However, Deitel does not specifically mention about obtaining information regarding

capabilities of the client.

Guheen-Andersen discloses the well-known concept of obtaining information regarding

capabilities of the client (e.g., paragraph 27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Deitel with the teachings of Guheen-Andersen in order to

facilitate obtaining information regarding capabilities of the client because the obtained

information would help know what information needs to be provided to the client. The client

would utilize the provided information specific to the component being used.

6.   As per claims 2-6, 8-13, Deitel and Guheen-Andersen disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above. Deitel also teaches the following:

        a third class to manipulate at least one cookie, cookies (e.g., Cookie class, page 955),

        a fourth class to handle file transfers (e.g., Subclasses of File Class, page 876),

        a fifth class to provide exception information (e.g., Exception classes, page 714),

        a set of classes that enable building and using web services (e.g., classes and subclasses

of section 21.3, Reading a file on a web server class, page 1008),

        a sixth class to control operation of an output cache (e.g., create the ObjectOutputStream

first and flush the stream, page 1018),

a set of classes that allow a user to create controls and pages that represent a user

interface on a web page (e.g., chapter 21.2, classes to manipulating URLs and creating objects on

the web page, page 1004, classes and subclasses of java.io.*, java.net.*, java.awt.*,

java.awt.event.*, javax.swing.*, java.util.*, java.swing.*, java.swing.event.*,

java.applet.AppletContext, etc., pages 1005-1036),

HTML controls that allow a user to create HTML server controls on a web page (e.g.,

chapter 21.2, classes to manipulating URLs and creating objects including control objects on the

web page, pages 1004-1036, the servlet API, page 939, servlet runninig on a server including a

web server, page 945, pages 936-977),

the HTML server controls are executed on a server and map to standard HTML tags (e.g.,

form control mapping to the HTML document, page 953, servlet running on a server including a

web server, page 945, pages 936-977),

web controls that allow a user to create web server controls on a web page (e.g., chapter

21.2, classes to manipulating URLs and creating objects including control objects on the web

page, pages 1004-1036, the servlet API, page 939, servlet runninig on a server including a web

server, page 945, pages 936-977),

the web controls are executed on a web server and include form controls (e.g., servlet

running on a server including a web server, page 945, form control, page 953, pages 936-977),

a web method attribute class to programmatically expose a method over the web (e.g.,

classes and subclasses of java.rmi.*, java.rmi.server.*, classes used to build distributed

applications for web servers, page 984, 980-998).

7.   As per claims 15, 21, 22, 27 and 28, Deitel teaches an application program interface

embodied on one or more computer readable media (e.g., page 17), a network software

architecture (e.g., chapter 21, page 1002), a method (e.g., page 17) comprising:

a first class to provide information regarding a current HTTP request (e.g., subclasses of

HTTPServlet class, chapter 19, page 936),

a second class to manage an HTTP output stream to a client (e.g., subclasses of

HTTPServlet class, chapter 19, page 936, figure 19.5 of page 943, figure 17.3 of page 822, and

figure 17.4 of page 829),

an object to provide access to server-based utilities and processes (e.g., Servlets, chapter

19, page 936, use of java utilities, figure 6.6, page 217),

a set of classes that enable building and using web services (e.g., classes and subclasses

of java.io.*, java.net.*, java.awt.*, java.awt.event.*, javax.swing.*, java.util.*, java.swing.*,

java.swing.event.*, java.applet.AppletContext, etc., page 1005).

However, Deitel does not specifically mention about services related to obtaining

information regarding capabilities of a browser application running on the client, to manage

information regarding capabilities of the client, and the one or more second functions to manage

a plurality of cookies associated with a particular web application.

Guheen-Andersen discloses the well-known concept of services related to obtaining

information regarding capabilities of a browser application running on the client (e.g., paragraph

27), to manage information regarding capabilities of the client (e.g., paragraph 3864), and the

one or more second functions to manage a plurality of cookies associated with a particular web

application (e.g., paragraphs 3849 - 3863).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Deitel with the teachings of Guheen-Andersen in order to

facilitate services related to obtaining information regarding capabilities of a browser application

running on the client, to manage information regarding capabilities of the client, and the one or

more second functions to manage a plurality of cookies associated with a particular web

application because the obtained information would help know what information needs to be

provided to the client based on the browser. The client would utilize the provided information

specific to the component being used. The cookies would support session management for the

web application.

8.   As per claims 16-20, 23-26, 29-31, Deitel and Guheen-Andersen disclose the claimed

limitations as rejected above. Deitel also teaches the following:

a third class to manipulate at least one cookie, cookies (e.g., Cookie class, page 955),

a fourth class to handle file transfers (e.g., Subclasses of File Class, page 876),

a fifth class to provide exception information (e.g., Exception classes, page 714),

a set of classes that enable building and using web services (e.g., classes and subclasses

of section 21.3, Reading a file on a web server class, page 1008),

a sixth class to control operation of an output cache (e.g., create the ObjectOutputStream

first and flush the stream, page 1018),

a set of classes that allow a user to create controls and pages that represent a user

interface on a web page (e.g., chapter 21.2, classes to manipulating URLs and creating objects on

the web page, page 1004, classes and subclasses of java.io.*, java.net.*, java.awt.*,

java.awt.event.*, javax.swing.*, java.util.*, java.swing.*, java.swing.event.*,

java.applet.AppletContext, etc., pages 1005-1006),

       HTML controls that allow a user to create HTML server controls on a web page (e.g.,

chapter 21.2, classes to manipulating URLs and creating objects including control objects on the

web page, pages 1004-1036, the servlet API, page 939, servlet runninig on a server including a

web server, page 945, pages 936-937),

       the HTML server controls are executed on a server and map to standard HTML tags (e.g.,

form control mapping to the HTML document, page 953, servlet running on a server including a

web server, page 945, pages 936-937),

       web controls that allow a user to create web server controls on a web page (e.g., chapter

21.2, classes to manipulating URLs and creating objects including control objects on the web

page, pages 1004-1036, the servlet API, page 939, servlet runninig on a server including a web

server, page 945, pages 936-937),

       the web controls are executed on a web server and include form controls (e.g., servlet

running on a server including a web server, page 945, form control, page 953, pages 936-937),

       a web method attribute class to programmatically expose a method over the web (e.g.,

classes and subclasses of java.rmi.*, java.rmi.server.*, classes used to build distributed

applications for web servers, page 984, 980).

9.   As per claims 32, 33, Deitel and Guheen-Andersen disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above. Deitel also teaches the following:

the first class provides HTTP values sent by a client during a web request (e.g., page 216, figure 6.6, section 20.1, page 981),

the second class manages a stream of data output to the client (e.g., figure 17.3 of page 822, figure 17.4 of page 829).

10.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitel and Guheen-Andersen in view of "Official Notice".

11.   As per claim 7, Deitel and Guheen-Andersen disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Deitel also teaches the following:

a web service class (e.g., classes and subclasses of section 21.3, Reading a file on a web server class, page 1008),

Deitel also teaches the following:

to define a base class (e.g., defining a base class, public class ReadServerFile extends Jframe, Container c, enter = new JtextField(), etc., page 1008).

However, Deitel does not specifically mention of defining a base class for web services. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing a base class for web services is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a base class for web services with the teachings of Deitel in order to facilitate creation of a base class for web services because defining a base class helps the object-oriented programmers to define objects, i.e., other classes and subclasses that can use the existing

functionality of the base class. Hence, different web services would benefit the characteristic of

the defined base class.

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and

not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to

8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

July 24, 2005

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100